



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/806,204

03/22/2004

David A. Selby

RSW920030089US1

1932

47121

7590

08/07/2009

(SAUL-END) PATENT DOCKETING CLERK  
IBM Corporation (SAUL-END) C/O Saul Ewing LLP  
Penn National Insurance Tower  
2 North Second Street, 7th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

EXAMINER

BOYCE, ANDRE D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/07/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/806,204</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> SELBY, DAVID A.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b> Andre Boyce</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b> 3623</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 17 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection to claims 1-8 under 35 USC §101.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Andre Boyce/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The declaration filed on July 17, 2009 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Quatse et al (US 2005/0010472) reference.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Quatse et al (US 2005/0010472) reference.

As discussed in MPEP 715.07, "[i]n general, proof of actual reduction to practice requires a showing that the apparatus actually existed and worked for its intended purpose. However, 'there are some devices so simple that a mere construction of them is all that is necessary to constitute reduction to practice.' In re Asahi /America Inc., 68 F.3d 442, 37 USPQ2d 1204, 1206 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (Citing Newkirk v. Lulejian, 825 F.2d 1581, 3USPQ2d 1793 (Fed. Cir. 1987) and Sachs v. Wadsworth, 48 F.2d 928, 929, 9 USPQ 252, 253 (CCPA 1931). The claimed restraint coupling held to be so simple a device that mere construction of it was sufficient to constitute reduction to practice. Photographs, coupled with articles and a technical report describing the coupling in detail were sufficient to show reduction to practice.). The facts to be established under 37 CFR 1.131 are similar to those to be proved in interference. The difference lies in the way in which the evidence is presented. If applicant disagrees with a holding that the facts are insufficient to overcome the rejection, his or her remedy is by appeal from the continued rejection."

Following, for actual reduction, as Applicant alleges in this case, MPEP 2138.05 requires "[i]n an interference proceeding, a party seeking to establish an actual reduction to practice must satisfy a two-prong test: (1) the party constructed an embodiment or performed a process that met every element of the interference count, and (2) the embodiment or process operated for its intended purpose." Eaton v. Evans, 204 F.3d 1094, 1097, 53 USPQ2d 1696, 1698 (Fed. Cir. 2000). The same evidence sufficient for a constructive reduction to practice may be insufficient to establish an actual reduction to practice, which requires a showing of the invention in a physical or tangible form that shows every element of the count. Wetmore v. Quick, 536 F.2d 937, 942, 190 USPQ 223, 227 (CCPA 1976). For an actual reduction to practice, the invention must have been sufficiently tested to demonstrate that it will work for its intended purpose, but it need not be in a commercially satisfactory stage of development. See, e.g., Scott v. Finney, 34 F.3d 1058, 1062, 32 USPQ2d 1115, 1118-19 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (citing numerous cases wherein the character of the testing necessary to support an actual reduction to practice varied with the complexity of the invention and the problem it solved)."

As such, with respect to prong (1), Applicant must have constructed an embodiment or a performed a process that meets all the limitations of claims 1-24. Here, Applicant submits an invention disclosure containing a title page, 6 redacted pages, 7 pages disclosing a method of optimisation of marketing resources, and computer program code Applicant asserts is the basis of the present invention.

However, the computer program code Applicant submitted does not adequately provide evidence indicating that Applicant constructed an embodiment or performed a process for selecting an optimal set of events to be performed, where each event has a value and where the selection of any event reduces or leaves unchanged the value of unselected events, comprising the following computer-implemented steps: performing a first sort on all unselected events to form a pending event list, so that the events are ordered sequentially by their values, with the highest valued event being at the top of the pending event list; selecting the highest valued unselected event upon the occurrence of a predetermined trigger; recomputing the values of each event after the selection of the highest valued unselected event; and moving the highest valued unselected event, after performance of the recomputing step, to the top of the pending event list without performing a second sort of the entire pending event list. Moreover, Applicant has not provided evidence indicating Applicant constructed an embodiment or performed a process as seen in dependent claims 2-8.